

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104)
Assistant United States Attorneys

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7241
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
owen.martikan@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR 10-0185 MMC

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT LARRY SANDERSON,

Defendant.

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME**

On March 22, 2010, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for identification of counsel and for a further detention hearing. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from March 22, 2010, through April 7, 2010, for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

The parties agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the

//

best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

/s/

DATED: April 28, 2010

OWEN P. MARTIKAN
Assistant United States Attorney

/s/

DATED: April 28, 2010

RITA B. BOSWORTH
Attorney for Robert Larry Sanderson

[~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER

As the Court found on March 22, 2010, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of time from March 22, 2010, through April 7, 2010, is warranted because the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/12/10

